

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 4-8 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US 6,100,953).

Claims 2 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. in view of Woo et al. (US 6,067,140).

Claims 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Claims 2, 5-7, and 9-17 have been amended, and claims 1, 3, 4, and 8 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 2, 5-7, and 9-17 are currently pending.

All Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Final Office Action asserts that the feature of “both the first electrode and the light-shielding layer are within a same unit pixel region,” as set forth in claims 15-17 is new matter. See page 3, lines 1-4 of the Final Office Action. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the relevant art would recognize that gate and data lines, which typically are arranged substantially perpendicular to each other and crossing each other, define a plurality of pixel regions. It is further respectfully submitted that

one skilled in the relevant art would recognize that a TFT and a pixel electrode are within each of the pixel regions. For instance, the primarily cited reference, Kim et al., discloses that

“[i]n the conventional LCD, a plurality of gate bus lines arranged in a first direction on a first substrate and a plurality of data bus lines arranged in a second direction on the first substrate divide the first substrate into a plurality of pixel regions. A thin film transistor (TFT) applies an image signal delivered from the data bus line to a pixel electrode 13 on a passivation layer. The TFT is formed on each pixel region.” Column 1, lines 26-32 of Kim et al.”

Also, at paragraph [0003], the original specification describes that “[i]n general, an LCD device includes lower and upper substrates. In the lower substrate, a plurality of pixel regions are arranged in a matrix shape, and each pixel region has a thin film transistor (TFT) and a pixel electrode.” Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that, especially in light of the disclosure of Kim et al., the original specification of the present application would reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that gate and data lines define pixel regions, and that each pixel region has one TFT and one pixel electrode.

Further, for example, at paragraph [0038], the original specification discusses that

“the LCD device of the present invention includes first and second transparent substrates (both not shown) opposing each other and a first transparent electrode 22 having a plurality of slit patterns 21, at a constant distance on the first substrate. The slit patterns 21 in the present invention are shown as a discontinuity in the pixel electrode (or the first transparent electrode 22).”

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the original specification reasonably conveys to one skilled in the relevant art that a preferred embodiment of the present invention includes a pixel electrode (22) having a plurality of slit patterns. In particular, the original specification, as a whole, would reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that in contrast to gate and

data lines that define pixel regions, the slit patterns of the present invention are shown as a discontinuity in the first pixel electrode (22) and this discontinuity does not illustrate multiple pixel regions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the original specification reasonably conveys to one skilled in the relevant art that the pixel electrode of the present invention having slit patterns is within a unit pixel region.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the original specification satisfies the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and that claims 15-17 contain subject matter which **was** described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 4-8 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US 6,100,953), and claims 2 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. in view of Woo et al. (US 6,067,140).

Applicants respectfully submit that the cancellation of claims 1, 3, 4, and 8, and the amendments to claims 2, 5-7, and 9-17 renders these rejections moot.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: December 23, 2003

Customer No.: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202.739.3000

Facsimile: 202.739.3001